

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. No claims have been amended, added, or cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-60 are presented for examination.

**35 U.S.C. §102(a) Rejection**

Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 26, 27, 31, 32, 35, 38, 41, 45-50, 53-56, 58-60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Intel et al. (10/18/00), also known as "Content Protection for Recordable Media Specification", Revision 0.94, dated October 18, 2000 (hereinafter "Article 1").

For the record, Applicants note that Article 1 as a whole was authored by the 4C Entity, LLC. The 4C Entity is a licensor of Content Protection for Recordable Media (CPRM), amongst other subjects, and includes the entities IBM, Intel, Matsushita and Toshiba. Applicants were each employees of Intel at the time the subject application was filed.

A Declaration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.132 (hereinafter "the Declaration") is submitted herewith. The Declaration has been signed by Applicants, stating that any inventive subject matter that may be disclosed in Article 1 originated with, or was obtained from, Applicants (i.e., the named inventors of the subject application). Therefore, it is believed that Article 1 does not qualify as prior art with respect to the subject application.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 10-13, 26, 27, 31, 32, 35, 38, 41, 45-50, 53-56, 58-60 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Article 1 should be withdrawn, and that these claims should be allowed.

### **35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection**

Claims 3-9, 14-16, 17-25, 28-30, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42-44, 51, 52, and 57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Intel, and further in view of Intel et al. (1/31/01), also known as "Content Protection for Prerecorded Media Specification", Revision 0.93, dated January 31, 2001 (hereinafter "Article 2").

A Declaration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.132 (hereinafter "the Declaration") is submitted herewith. The Declaration has been signed by Applicants, stating that any inventive subject matter that may be disclosed in Article 2 originated with, or was obtained from, Applicants (i.e., the named inventors of the subject application). Therefore, it is believed that Article 2 does not qualify as prior art with respect to the subject application.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 3-9, 14-16, 17-25, 28-30, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42-44, 51, 52, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Article 2 should be withdrawn, and that these claims should be allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance. Therefore, allowance at an early date is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to initiate an interview with the undersigned by calling 949-498-0601 if the Examiner believes that such an interview will advance prosecution of this application.

**Request for an Extension of Time**


Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0221 to cover any necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

**Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 20, 2004



Libby H. Hope, Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 46,774  
Patent Practice Group  
INTEL CORPORATION

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(949) 498-0601